



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/025,610	12/26/2001	Arei Kobayashi	011736	4491
23850	7590	05/18/2005	EXAMINER	
ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS, HANSON & BROOKS, LLP 1725 K STREET, NW SUITE 1000 WASHINGTON, DC 20006			NGUYEN BA, PAUL H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 05/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/025,610

Applicant(s)

KOBAYASHI ET AL.

Examiner

Paul Nguyen-Ba

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 January 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant

1. This action is responsive to Applicant Amendments and Arguments filed on 1/25/2005.
2. Claims 1-8 have been considered. Claims 1 and 5 are independent claims.

Priority

3. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murashita, U.S. Patent No. 6,330,574, in view of Dean et al. ("Dean"), U.S. Patent No. 2002/0152244.

Claims

Murashita/Dean

1. A method for code processing of document data comprising the steps of: See Murashita Abstract.

Art Unit: 2176

encoding a document data written in a description language of an extensible text format to a code data,

See Murashita Title and col. 14, lines 46-54. The Murashita system encodes and compresses the SGML document.

based on a translation table written in a description language of an extensible text format; and processing said code data as said document data based on said translation table,

Murashita teaches encoding a document based on a translation table (col. 15, lines 26-38 *et seq.* → i.e. “tag code table”) and processing said code data based on the translation table (col. 16, lines 62-65 *et seq.*), but does not specifically teach *a translation table written in a description language of an extensible text format.*

However, Dean teaches auxiliary lookup tables encoded as extensible text format files for the purpose of further expanding the definition of the DTD (see [0157]). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Murashita with the teachings of Dean to include a translation table written in a description language of an extensible text format for the purpose of further expanding the definition of the DTD.

said translation table defining link information of other translation tables, defining a code length and a code assigned to items of said link information, an element name, an element value of said element name, an attribute name designated in said element name, an attribute name, and defining a code attribute value of said length and a code assigned for designate parentage structure between one element name and other element name.

Murashita, in view of Dean, teaches translation tables encoded as extensible text format files for further expanding the definition of the DTD to include defining code length as well as the legal building blocks of an XML document (see Dean [0157] → DTD defines the document structure with a list of elements, attributes, etc.; see also col. 4, lines 51-56; col. 21, lines 53 *et seq.*), but does not specifically teach defining a code assigned to items of said link information and defining a code assigned for designate parentage structure between one element name and other element name. However, it was commonly known and would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to define a code for link information in

order to create and describe links between resources and to define a code for parentage structure between elements (as evidenced by Gatz et al. → see [0015], [0049], [0059]; Duliba et al. → col. 23 lines 13-65; and Tenev et al.) for the purpose of reducing the amount of data to be transmitted.

2. ...wherein said items defined in said translation table used in said processing step are a subset of said items defined in said translation table used in said encoding step.

See Murashita col. 17, lines 1-12; col. 23, lines 60-67. The items defined in the processing step are a set whose members are members of the encoding step set.

3. ...wherein said encoding step encodes only the items that are defined in said translation table.

See Murashita col. 3, lines 25-33. The system processes the code defined in the document instance on the basis of the tag code table (i.e. translation table”).

4. ...wherein said encoding step includes adding of an occupancy data which indicates a length occupied by said item to a code indicating said item, and wherein said processing step decodes from said code data of a position that skips said occupancy data length of said code, in case that said code not defined in said translation table exists in said code data, without processing said code.

See Murashita col. 23, lines 1-4; col. 24, lines 18-67 *et seq.*, and col. 30 lines 10-47.

Regarding independent claim 5, please refer to the rationale relied upon to reject independent claim 1.

Regarding claim 6, please refer to the rationale relied upon to reject claim 2.

Regarding claim 7, please refer to the rationale relied upon to reject claim 3.

Regarding claim 8, please refer to the rationale relied upon to reject claim 4.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 1/25/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Pursuant to Applicant's request, Examiner has produced and submitted documental evidence teaching the claimed elements of "defining a code assigned to items of said link information and defining a code assigned for designate parentage structure between one element name and other element name" which were well known (see prior art made of record on form PT0-892 as well as claim 1 discussion above).

Applicant further contends that because Murashita, in view of Dean, does not define the element value and data type, Murashita/Dean must translate the received code data to a document data in a receiver, and therefore must parse the translated document data. Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Dean teaches, in one embodiment, lookup tables which stores the DATATYPE values for each DTD element and all translations of element names (see [0157]). These lookup tables, in and of themselves, can perform document processing directly from the received code data since the element (and attribute) values are already defined. It is Examiner's opinion that it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Murashita with the teachings of Dean to include defining and storing element (and attribute values) in the translation tables for the purpose of document processing directly from the received code data.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record on form PT0-892 and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111(c) to consider these references fully when responding to this action.

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul Nguyen-Ba whose telephone number is (571) 272-4094. The examiner can normally be reached from 10:30 am - 7:00 pm.

Art Unit: 2176

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PNB


JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER